

GN03016

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-12 are pending. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and the subject matter added to claims 1 and 8, respectively.

The specification has been amended to correct grammatical errors. No new subject matter has been added to the specification or claims.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kneezel (6,375,294), and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Kneezel in view of Barr et al. (US 2004/0223014). Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Kneezel in view of Barr and further in view of Hermanson (US5,581,284). Claims 6-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. These rejections and objections are respectfully traversed as follows.

Amended claim 1 recites a grey scale printing method including the steps of:

delivering first droplets of a first color having a first volume from a first printhead to first marking elements positioned at a fixed pitch from one another;

delivering from a second printhead second droplets of a second color having a second volume different from the first volume to second marking elements positioned at the same fixed pitch as the first marking elements; and

depositing the first and second droplets at exactly the same position on the medium to obtain a greyscale, so that the greyscale dots are positioned at the same fixed pitch as the pitch of the first and second marking elements.

GN03016

PATENT

Amended claim 1 indicates that the pitch of each printhead or the “nozzle pitch” of each printhead is exactly the same, where the nozzle pitch is well known as the distance between the centers of adjacent inkjet nozzles which corresponds with the distance between the centers of adjacent marking elements. Hence the first and second droplets of different colors from different printheads are positioned (centered) at exactly the same spot on the medium (see spec, page 12, lines 30-32), resulting in greyscale markings having the same fixed pitch as the marking elements.

Kneezel discloses a grey scale fluid ejection system with offset grid patterns of different size spots. Specifically, Kneezel discloses forming a greyscale image of *different sized droplets at different frequencies from different sized nozzles* where the nozzle pitch for the printhead with the larger nozzles is different from the nozzle pitch of the printhead with the smaller nozzles (see col. 6, lines 22-47 - note different print frequency).

Barr discloses an inkjet system and method to correct for malfunctioning, or inoperable, ink ejection elements in a one-pass printmode (par. [0009]). A printmask is described which controls printing of each nozzle and defines the number of drops deposited from an enabled nozzle (par. [0035]). Multiple droplets are dropped on a pixel or by adjacent ink ejection elements to “get sufficient color intensity” and to “hide print quality defects” (par. [0047]).

Hermanson discloses a system and method to extend life of an inkjet supply by filling in missing spots with a different color (col. 2, lines 10-28).

In contrast to the amended claims, none of the three references cited discloses obtaining greyscale markings of first and second printheads having a same fixed nozzle pitch and having

GN03016

PATENT

droplets positioned/centered at exactly the same spot on the medium, resulting in greyscale markings having the same fixed pitch as the marking elements. In order to sustain a §102 rejection of independent claims 1 and 8, each and every feature of the claims must be taught by the reference. Since Kneezel does not teach every feature of the amended claims, the rejection is overcome.

In determining a prima facie case for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, it is necessary to show that the combination of prior art teachings is proper, and that those teachings are sufficient to *suggest* making the claimed modifications to one of ordinary skill in the art. Since there is no discussion, suggestion or motivation in Kneezel, Barr or Hermanson of obtaining greyscale markings of first and second printheads having a same fixed nozzle pitch and having droplets positioned at exactly the same spot on the medium, resulting in greyscale markings having the same fixed pitch as the marking elements – then the combination of the references is inappropriate.

The arguments above apply to both independent claims 1 and 8 and those claims, as well as all claims dependent thereon, are now considered patentable.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed but is not considered material to the patentability of the invention.

No fees are believed to be due with this response. However, if an error has been made in the fee calculations, please charge any fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3377 under this general authorization.

GN03016

PATENT

It should be noted that the above arguments are directed towards certain patentable distinctions between the claims and the prior art cited. However, the patentable distinctions between the pending claims and the prior art cited are not necessarily limited to those discussed above.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection of the Office Action has been addressed and overcome so that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, withdraw the rejections and/or objections, and pass the application to issue. Should questions arise during examination, the Examiner is welcome to contact the applicant's attorney as listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Sabourin
Reg. No. 35,344

Agfa Corporation
Law & Patent Department
200 Ballardvale Street
Wilmington, MA. 01887-1069

Tel: 978-284-5604

RAS/pc